



Original article

The Janus face of local extractivism

Synneva Geithus Laastad

Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo, P.O. box 1096, Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Block 192
Extractivism
Mobilisation
Oil
Peru

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study of Block 192, Peru's largest oilfield, makes the case for a local form of extractivism. Local extractivism is triggered by firstly a dependence on the only economic activity there is in the area, and secondly by the strategic usage of extractive activity as local communities' sole bargaining chip towards the government. An analysis of news items and interviews with actors involved in processes regarding Block 192, finds that repeated socio-environmental conflicts and production shutdowns have led to an increased state presence and willingness to negotiate. The very activity that has had detrimental effects on local communities' livelihoods for decades is as such also their only hope for achieving public goods, welfare and income-generating opportunities: This is the Janus face of extractivism. The Janus-faced political space for permanent negotiations between communities and national government regarding both conditions for extraction and government services unrelated to the extractive activity, is created by the state's overarching imperative to continue extraction. This article thus calls for a broadened analytical focus on conditioned spaces for cross-scalar negotiation as an outcome of the extractive imperative, and more diversified representations of the local scale beyond sites of resistance or grounds for particularistic local agreements with industry only.

1. Introduction

In Roman mythology, Janus was the god of *inter alia* duality, and he is depicted as having two faces facing opposite directions. In vernacular terms, having a Janus face is understood as having two sharply contrasting sides. In the Peruvian Amazon rainforest, local indigenous communities that have lived next to oil extraction facilities for five decades have a similar dualist and contradictory apprehension of extractive activity. This contradiction is apparent in two different ways. The first one concerns local income opportunities. Oil production has introduced a monetary economy, and resulted in substantial local contamination (Guzmán-Gallegos, 2017; O'Callaghan-Gordo et al., 2018; Orta-Martínez et al., 2018; UNDP Peru, 2018). Both factors have meant that the local population has moved away from only relying on subsistence activities, to a condition where the foremost source of employment and income is the oil industry. This reflects the dual function of oil as a local resource-making practice: one that both destructs and enhances local livelihoods.

The second duality regards local actors' recurring threats and actions to shut down oil production. Oil production is local communities' sole bargaining chip to draw the national government's attention to their plights. Through simply occupying parts of the oil production

infrastructure, local indigenous communities' federations have repeatedly been able to halt production. This has proven to be an effective manner of gaining the state's attention. In an area devoid of state presence, oil production has as such become an instrument for demanding measures to mitigate and remediate the detrimental effects of the very same oil production, and provision of public services in the area.

These dynamics demonstrate an inherently contradictory local dependence on extractive activity, and the article argues that this can be understood as *local extractivism*. Extractivism has been defined as an economic activity or development strategy based on the appropriation and export of raw materials, but also as an imperative achieving 'teleological primacy' (Arsel et al., 2016b, p. 878). A main propensity in literature on Latin American extractivism is to understand extractivism as promoted by the national government, encountering resistance and opposition at the local scale. While recognising the important scholarly work carried out on local resistance and socio-environmental conflicts caused by states' extractivism, this article nonetheless argues for a more diversified understanding of the local scale, taking into account the conflictual relationship the local population may have with extractive activities, which is not always outright resistance, but one of uneasy coexistence. Studies that account for the conflictual relationships

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

E-mail address: s.g.laastad@sosgeo.uio.no.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2021.100903>

Received 16 September 2020; Received in revised form 11 March 2021; Accepted 11 March 2021

Available online 22 March 2021

2214-790X/© 2021 The Author. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

between local communities and extractive industries beyond outright resistance, mainly focus on negotiations between local communities and extractive companies (e.g. Helfgott, 2013; Himley, 2013; Manky, 2020). The case of Peruvian oilfield Block 192 demonstrates that in addition to negotiations between communities and companies, the overarching imperative of continued extraction opens up a political space for negotiations between communities and national government regarding not only the conditions for extraction, but also government services unrelated to the extractive activity.

This article therefore refutes two main tendencies in recent literature on Latin American extractivism: a focus on the early 2000s left-leaning governments in the region, and a clear scalar logic where the local scale is framed as resisting extractive projects imposed on them by the national state. It emphasises how extractivism eschews a left-right political divide, as it is also a structuring principle on which action is based in countries not part of the Latin American Left Turn, in this case Peru. The dynamics between the Peruvian state and the local inhabitants in Block 192 demonstrate that extractivism facilitates a state of permanent negotiation. The state's extractive imperative, the lack of local development alternatives and local communities' abilities to shut down oil production to demand socio-environmental benefits have led to a convergence of aims, with both parties now aiming for continued extraction but with high socio-environmental standards.

2. Tendencies in extractivism research

A reliance on extraction and export of unprocessed natural resources has been the historically dominant economic model of the Latin American region. Following the European colonisation of the Americas, Latin America came into being as a provider of raw materials, shipped back to Europe to high human and environmental tolls (Galeano, 1973). Extractivism as an economic activity in Latin America is as such not a recent phenomenon by any means, and primary commodities continue to be the main export for all countries in the region alongside agricultural products. The concept of extractivism has however experienced an upsurge in scholarly attention during the last decade and a half, caused by the Latin American left's increased dependence on resource rents. With important exceptions, most research on Latin American extractivism has focused on the centre-left and left governments in the region, their increased involvement in extractive industries and the socio-environmental consequences of expanded extraction. To fund increases in social spending and public investments, these governments needed revenues from continued and expanded extractive activity, a more uncontentious solution than aggressive redistribution (Arsel et al., 2016b; Farthing and Fabricant, 2018). Alongside their rhetoric of independence, there has been a deepening dependence on a single commodity, foreign operating companies, demand from other countries, particularly China, and a fluctuating international commodity market (Acosta, 2013; Lang, 2011).

These dependencies conjointly lead to a continuing need to expand the extractive frontier, a tendency which is strengthened by another contradiction: as international oil prices have plummeted, governments' stance is that more oil needs to be discovered and brought on stream, to gain the same levels of expected income. In the face of this deepening dependence on resource rents, understandings of extractivism have broadened from a more narrow focus on the economic activity of large scale export of unprocessed raw materials (Acosta, 2013; Gudynas, 2010), to a style of development (e.g. Dietz and Engels, 2017). Arsel et al. (2016a) launched the concept extractive imperative to describe the weight of extractive industries in the countries of the Latin American left. They deem extraction an imperative, as it 'needs to continue and expand regardless of prevailing circumstances' (p. 880). This they argue, is a self-sustained form of extractivism, which has taken over 'the logic of other state activities, reorienting policy objectives to further justify and advance extractivism' (p. 881). The authors use the political economy of the Latin American left as context for their analysis of the

extractive imperative, and argue that it was born from resource extraction financing social policy expenditures, through strong involvement of a developmental state in extractive activities and revenue flows. When more extraction emerges as the response to all internal and external challenges, extractivism assumes 'teleological primacy', and becomes the goal in and of itself.

This article analyses the extractive imperative's resulting political space in Peru, a country with a highly neoliberal and open economy, which did not undergo a turn to the left in the 2000s. This is in line with Svampa's (2012) argument that a 'commodity consensus' has replaced the Washington consensus in Latin America, and that this consensus can be understood as a new economic and political-ideological order extending beyond political differences of Latin American governments. Smart (2020) demonstrates that there has been an increased dependence on extractive activities in the whole Latin American region, notwithstanding political ideologies of national governments. In the case of Peru, Campanera Reig, 2019 finds that environmental policy is purposely weak towards extractive industries and Silva Santisteban (2016) demonstrates an othering and criminalisation of opposition to mining, due to cross-political agreement on the need to extract. Extractivism has reached a Gramscian 'common sense' position (Gudynas, 2019; Silva Santisteban, 2016; Svampa, 2012).

A second feature of recent literature on Latin American extractivism is its aforementioned scalar logic, which tends to be as follows: Extractivism is instigated due to the national state reacting to international patterns of trade, moving down to the local scale in the form of new extractive projects at the extractive frontier, colliding with locally formed resistance, which occasionally gains national traction. Socio-environmental conflicts are often portrayed as binary conflicts between indigenous organisations or socio-territorial movements on one side, and governments and/or large economic corporations on the other (Avci and Fernández-Salvador, 2016; Bebbington et al., 2008; Llave Huamancha, 2020; Svampa, 2019). Local sites close to extractive activities are therefore represented as the resistant other to state power and global capitalism, or its 'sacrifice zone' (e.g. Bebbington et al., 2013; Dietz and Engels, 2017; Shade, 2015; Smart, 2020; Szablowski, 2019).

In these representations of the local scale as sites of conflict and resistance, there is a propensity to implicitly understand indigenous as 'natural conservationists' (e.g. Acuña, 2015; Stammer and Ivanova, 2016). The expansion of the extractive frontier means that the local scale and those living closest to extraction sites are often indigenous communities. There is a tendency to understand indigenous peoples as guardians of traditional livelihoods and therefore as 'incapable of anything but confronting and rejecting change', and furthermore as 'natural allies of the natural environment' (McNeish, 2012, p. 39). This is a potentially reductive and one-dimensional representation of indigenous response to extractive projects, which risks interpreting indigenous peoples as subject to circumstance.

Exceptions to this tendency are found in literature on relations between local communities and private extractive industries, which finds a more complex local relationship with extractivism in negotiated agreements with companies, and in labour relations. Wanvik and Caine (2017) demonstrate the agency of indigenous Metis communities in Alberta, Canada, in their engagement with the oil sand industry. They conclude that 'indigenous engagement with extractive industry developments is neither static nor responsive in character', arguing that this requires a re-thinking of indigenous communities as not just 'passive victims or as only responsive to external pressure; we now see indigenous communities as goal-motivated [and] pragmatic' (p. 603). According to Kuokkanen (2019), 'the most common form of indigenous engagement include negotiating agreements with resource companies and participating in environmental impact assessment processes' (p. 16). Community-industry impact benefits agreements have become standard practice in Canada and Australia. These are privately negotiated and confidential, but typically include clauses on employment, infrastructure, social, cultural and environmental programmes and

educational and training opportunities (Kuokkanen, 2019; Peterson St-Laurent and Billon, 2015; Wanvik and Caine, 2017). Some local governments in the US have adopted Memorandums of Understandings with fracking companies, with input from local communities (Zilliox and Smith, 2017). In mining projects in both the Global North and South, gaining a Social Licence to Operate has become an increasingly normal practice to manage community relations (Mulhern et al., 2020; Nguyen, 2020; Ofori and Ofori, 2019; Wilson, 2016)

In case studies from the Global South, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) have been covered (e.g. Aguilar-Støen and Hirsch, 2015). These are required in extractive projects, and are bureaucratic procedures with some participatory mechanisms to establish baselines and identify impacts. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) have also been found to create an arena for local engagement, if local communities have the leverage to demand CSR measures specific to local needs (Hayk, 2019). In a study on the Pieira gold mine in Peru, Himley (2013) sketches the outlines of a limited political space, where the international company operating the mine accepted demands for temporary employment for locals, as long as it was able to place it in a CSR framework. When local demands rose to also include wage increase and unionisation, it resulted in violent clashes.

A number of case studies highlight how local communities function as both affected communities and employees, and how possibilities for local employment are a main point of pragmatic local negotiation efforts towards the company. Manky (2020) finds that in the case of the Antamina copper mine in Peru, even local negotiations between the operating company and local communities regarding environmental issues resulted in clauses on local employment. Helfgott (2013) finds the same attempts to use the mining companies for local development efforts in the Central Highlands of Peru, where mining companies were subjected to demands for local employment, scholarships and support for local production activities.

Contentious action as not just resistance to extraction but also as a local level negotiation strategy has been covered by Orta-Martínez et al. (2018) and Hudayana et al. (2020), who argue that the most effective indigenous strategy to improve conditions of local extractive activities can be open conflict. Hudayana et al. (2020) find that in the case of nickel mining industry in Indonesia, activist instigators mobilised community masses to protest and sabotage as a strategy to successfully negotiate compensation for the negative impacts of mining. Orta-Martínez et al. (2018) analyse oilfield Block 192 and neighbouring Block 8 and argue that direct action is sometimes required to overcome environmental injustices. Dialogue between affected communities, industry and government is not a goal in itself, if it is characterised by consistent bureaucratic stalling and low levels of goal achievement.

The abovementioned studies examine local positions beyond outright resistance, but largely focus on relations between local communities and extractive industries. In these particularistic local arrangements, be they community-industry impact benefits agreements, local input in EIAs and CSR measures or pragmatic decisions to occupy, protest or accept extraction, affected communities have been able to negotiate *inter alia* compensations, local hiring practices, environmental remediation and funding for local development initiatives, from *industry*. Oil production is also realised by private actors in Block 192. Nonetheless, local actors have been able to strategically utilise their possibilities to impact oil production as a bargaining chip to leverage the *state*, and demand environmental remediation and public services. This state-society dynamic is analysed below.

3. A case study of Block 192

Block 192 is Peru's largest and oldest oilfield, located in the Northern Peruvian Amazon, by the border to Ecuador. Operation commenced in 1971 under its previous name Block 1AB. It encompasses an area totalling 4970 km², with 118 oil wells currently active, producing approximately 11,000 barrels a day, around 15 per cent of the total oil

production in Peru (UNDP Peru, 2018). The oilfield overlaps with the Corrientes, Pastaza and Tigre river basins, with an indigenous population of 45,000, from the Achuar, Kichwa and Quechua people (Instituto del Bien Común, 2016, as cited in Orta-Martínez et al., 2018). 101 indigenous communities are organised in four federations: FEDIQUEP (the Quechua indigenous federation of Pastaza); FECONACOR (the federation of native communities in the Corrientes river basin); OPI-KAFPE (organisation of the Kichwa Amazonian Indigenous peoples of the Peru-Ecuador border); and ACODESCOPAT (the Kukama development and conservation association San Pablo de Tipishca), the latter representing Kukama communities in the Marañon river basin, downstream from the oilfield. Since 2011, these federations have addressed the state and oil companies collectively through PUINAMUDT (abbreviated from Spanish *Pueblos indígenas amazónicos unidos en defensa de sus territorios*, Amazonian indigenous peoples united in defence of their territories) a platform interchangeably called the *Cuatro Cuencas*, the Four River Basins in Spanish (PUINAMUDT, 2020a).

The following analysis of the dynamics between the state and local communities in Block 192 is based on an abductive research design involving a two-step data collection process. Firstly, all articles and opinion pieces (487 items) discussing Block 192 between 2015 and mid-2018 from the online archives of the two largest dailies in Peru, the centre-left *La República* and the conservative *El Comercio* were downloaded, systematised and analysed. This first step provided a timeline of events and an overview of the actors involved and their positions. This facilitated intermediate research questions and an interview guide for the second phase, which consisted of semi-structured interviews with twenty-three key actors in Lima and Iquitos, Peru in the autumn of 2018. These were representatives from NGOs with experience working with the indigenous communities in Block 192 (9), government officials directly involved in negotiations and policies related to Block 192 (7), one representative from the oil sector, engaged academics (2), advisors to PUINAMUDT (3) and one leader of the indigenous federations representing the communities within Block 192. There is an underrepresentation of indigenous voices in this sample, although their views align with those of their advisors. To nonetheless properly encompass their points of view, the analysis relies extensively on news items from PUINAMUDT's website and their social media postings, and indigenous actors' statements and comments to the media. In addition to peer-reviewed research articles regarding Block 192, the analysis also rely on statements from the Ombudsman's Office, NGO reports and UNDP Peru's independent technical study of former Block 1AB.

4. Local extractivism

The National Office for Natural Resource Assessment established already in 1984 that Block 192 was 'the most polluted region in the country' (Guzmán-Gallegos, 2017, p. 1114). From 1972 until 1997, oil production in then Block 1AB produced a daily average of 762,000 barrels of produced water, the water extracted from the oil wells along with oil, compared to a daily average of 52,286 barrels of oil (Ministerio de Energía y Minas, 1998). This wastewater contains high levels of hydrocarbons, chlorides and heavy metals such as barium, cadmium, lead and mercury (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017; Orta Martínez et al., 2007; Yusta-García et al., 2017). Produced water has a salinity level four times that of seawater, impacting the fresh water biotope (Doyle, 1994). Produced water was until 2009 freely dispatched into surrounding bodies of water, when reinjection mechanisms were put in place, an outcome of indigenous protest and negotiation (Orta-Martínez et al., 2018).

Other environmental problems include dumping of solid waste and drilling mud, and abandonment of open waste pits, without any remediation (Ministerio de Energía y Minas, 1998; Orta Martínez et al., 2007). Petroleum spills are a frequent and reoccurring problem, and visible petroleum spills have been documented in rivers, soils and production facilities (Orta Martínez et al., 2007; UNDP Peru, 2018). Oil

production has moreover led to deforestation, and 400 km of roads and pipelines have been built in the area, which have caused an intensification in illegal logging and hunting (Orta Martínez et al., 2007).

Levels of heavy metals in sampled fish tissues indicate bio-accumulation, and are above those fit for human consumption (Orta Martínez et al., 2007; Rosell-Melé et al., 2018). Several studies have found levels of lead, cadmium, barium, mercury and arsenic in blood and urine samples from locals above permissible limits (O'Callaghan-Gordo et al., 2018; Orta Martínez et al., 2007). Elevated levels of lead is linked to hypertension and cardiovascular disease, mercury is linked to neurological diseases, and cadmium to increased risks of cancer (Defensoría del Pueblo, 2018). Allergic reactions to the skin and eyes are also possibly linked to oil contamination (La Torre Lopez, 1998). Additionally, the awareness that the water the local populations rely on for cooking, cleaning and consumption is contaminated with heavy metals and oil residues leads to anxiety and uncertainty (UNDP Peru, 2018). Locals have heard that they should not consume local fish and water, but have no other available options (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017).

Despite the grave environmental and public health consequences of oil production in Block 192, a termination of oil production is not a desired solution for any parties involved. This is due to the economic dependence on oil activity, which has increased as subsistence agriculture and fishing have declined due to the environmental impacts of oil extraction. Locals testify that their agricultural yields have declined, along with sales to local markets due to known pollution in the area (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017; UNDP Peru, 2018). The enclave-like nature of the local oil economy and local inflation has meant that any goods and merchandise are highly priced locally (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017). Consequently, there are few income opportunities that are not related to oil production. In Block 192, several local community service companies tied to oil activity have been created, and these carry out low-paid menial work such as cleaning up oil spills, road management and waste management, without insufficient safety measures and supervision (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017; UNDP Peru, 2018). Pluspetrol, the transnational company operating the field until 2015, used the selective contracting of local companies to form clientelistic relations and create internal divisions (Campanario Baqué and Doyle, 2017). The current operating company, Frontera Energy, employs close to 3000 people directly, 35% of these are from the area. The local economy has consequently become an oil economy, and this undermines the possibilities of alternative development strategies.

The local position towards operating companies was summed up by Diandra Torres of the NGO DAR (*Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales*, Law, Environment and Natural Resources) as 'remediate, but stay' (interview with author, October 2018). Indigenous leaders have repeatedly stated that they are not against oil production, as they are not against development. Carlos Sandi, leader of FECONACO, stated in 2015 that 'we are not against oil production, we are not against development, we agree, but we want it to be a responsible production. Respecting our environment, us, our rivers, our children' (La República, 2015b). Similarly, during protests and occupations in 2017, Aurelio Chino, leader of FEDIQUEP stated that 'we are not against oil production in our territories, we just ask the government for previous consultation' (AFP, 2017). Tedy Maca, leader of Nueva Andoas, one of the communities in the area, stated that 'this is a peaceful strike. We are guaranteeing the company that there will be no damages to their infrastructure, because what we want is that the benefits will be fair for everyone, for the state, the company and the population' (DPAES, 2017).

These are articulations of local extractivism. Local mobilising actors operate within a hegemonic discourse understanding development as dependant on extraction, but the aspiration is that the oil production should result in benefits locally. This observation echoes that of Arsel et al. (2019) regarding oil extraction in the Ecuadorian Amazon, where inhabitants are also well aware of the detrimental effects oil extraction

has had on their livelihoods and health. Due a lack of alternative strategies to deliver material improvements however, limited and partial benefits of oil-led development is the only path to improvement. This 'misery of missing alternatives' they name 'Maria's paradox' (p. 215).

5. Bargaining chip

The second reason why the duality of local extractivism is emphasised, is that it has proven the most effective way of gaining government attention to an area characterised by a historical lack of state presence. The Amazon region of Peru is the most neglected and marginalised area of the country (Espinosa, 2009; Grillo and Sharon, 2012). Any welfare services were first provided by missionaries, then later oil companies, in a distorted but well-known pattern of appeasements for their dispossession. Indigenous federations' possibilities to influence ongoing oil production is a means to achieve state attention, gain concessions, compensation or public goods. Orta-Martínez et al. (2018) find that in the case of Block 192, open conflict is required to achieve real progress in negotiations with state and company and to overcome environmental injustices. This study complements Orta-Martínez et al.'s thesis with an analysis of the structures allowing for the effectiveness of open conflict in gaining concessions from the state. The state apprehends extraction as imperative at all costs in any circumstance, and this lends the indigenous federations in the oilfield agency and negotiation power, due to their capacity to easily halt oil production through take-overs of oil installations. The conflict between the state and the local populations in Block 192 however is not of resistance or rejection, but of conditioned coexistence (Carlos Monge, Natural Resource Governance Institute, interview with author August 2018). This type of conflict results in a state of permanent negotiation, which is not a means to an end, but the situation that is seemingly most beneficial to all parties.

The dynamics between the indigenous federations in Block 192 and the government follows a clear pattern. Claims are set forth by the indigenous federations, both towards the operating company, regarding remediation and payment for the use of their territories, and towards the national state, regarding health services, development programmes and ultimately previous consultation. When these claims are not met, the indigenous federations either threaten to occupy, or occupy, parts of the oil infrastructure, shutting down oil production. High-level government officials have tended to arrive to the area to negotiate when this occurs, and negotiations have led to a series of agreements – accords – between the federations and the government. In some of these accords the operating company also agrees to carry out measures. The Ombudsman have had an observatory role. Repeatedly, there are large delays in implementation or measures never materialise, leading to new rounds of occupations, negotiations and agreements.

These rounds of negotiations have so far resulted in seven accords (*actas* in Spanish) between the indigenous federations pertaining to PUINAMUDT and the government. FECONACO shut down half of the country's oil production in 2006, after a failed meeting with government officials regarding a health programme and the creation of a multisector commission, to address the findings of the first Ministry of Health study demonstrating high rates of heavy metals in blood samples. This was the first time an Amazonian indigenous group used this type of direct action as a negotiation strategy (Bebbington and Scurrah, 2013). Government delegations arrived within two days, and negotiations resulted in the Dorissa Accord, an agreement between the government, the then operating company Pluspetrol, FECONACO and their advisors. This agreement included the reinjection of produced water, completed in 2009, a comprehensive health plan funded by Pluspetrol, a small hospital, a comprehensive development plan managed by the regional government, and an inclusion of the local population in the national basic health service (Bebbington and Scurrah, 2013). The health plan and the hospital never materialised however, and the development plan was not implemented (Bebbington and Scurrah, 2013).

The unsuccessful implementation of parts of the Dorissa Accord

eventually led to new direct actions and threats to occupy oil installations in 2012, and a new round of negotiations as top government officials such as the Ministers of Health and Environment were dispatched to the area (Orta-Martínez et al., 2018). This resulted in a new agreement, the Alianza Topal Accords, where the parties agreed on local development demands to be executed by the regional government, a comprehensive health plan this time managed by the Department of Health, and the creation of a multisector commission to investigate oil contamination, this time for the whole area of Block 192, as the four federations had started organising jointly through PUINAMUDT in 2011 (Orta-Martínez et al., 2018). The results of the latter led the government to declare an environmental and later health emergency in the area (Orta-Martínez et al., 2018). This required establishing action plans, regarding inter alia installations of water treatment plants. As these were also delayed, the federations responded with a new threat to occupy production facilities in 2014, and were through these means able to demand new deadlines. The first water treatment plant was installed in March 2015, inaugurated by the then Peruvian President, Ollanta Humala (Orta-Martínez et al., 2018; PUINAMUDT, 2015c).

In 2015 three accords were agreed upon by the government and the indigenous federations. The Lima Accord in March was an outcome of the third multisector commission, created in 2014 (UNDP Peru, 2018). It promised an independent technical study of the oilfield, which was executed by UNDP Peru, and published in 2018 (UNDP Peru, 2018). A contingency fund for environmental remediation was agreed upon, the implementation of a health care system, further water treatment installations, electrification, remediation of polluted sites, and an agreement to undertake an epidemiological and toxicological study (Ministerio del Ambiente, 2015). Yet again, the failure to implement parts of the Lima accord led to new protests already in September 2015, when the federations blocked the operations of all oil wells in Block 192 for 15 days. The blockade came to an end through the signing of a new agreement, the Teniente Lopez accord (PUINAMUDT, 2015a). This agreement follows up on the Lima accord, with a deadline to start the health study, further promises of electrification and an agreement that all communities within block 192 shall receive 0.75 per cent of oil revenues (as opposed to the 2.5 per cent demanded) (PUINAMUDT, 2015a). The third accord of 2015 was signed in José Olaya, and the agreements here in large parts concern the follow-up of previously agreed upon courses of action, further operationalising, deciding responsibilities and setting deadlines (PUINAMUDT, 2015b).

Parallel to the cycles of protests and agreements between the government and the local communities, there was a change in ownership of the oilfield. Pluspetrol's contract expired in 2015, and before the entry of a new company, the federations demanded previous consultation and free, prior and informed consent, which had been codified into national law in 2011. No companies expressed interests in a new thirty year-long contract after an international bidding process in 2015, and Canadian company Pacific Stratus Energy, since Frontera Energy, accepted an interim operating contract for two years after direct negotiation with the Peruvian government. A previous consultation was carried out, but hastily, and no agreement was reached between the government and PUINAMUDT, only with two other federations downstream from the area, of competing interest with the PUINAMUDT platform (El Comercio, 2015).

There have been several periods of prolonged halts in oil production in Block 192, due to temporary stops in the operation of the North Peruvian pipeline transporting the crude from the Amazon to the coast due to oil spills and lack of maintenance, or production halts caused by indigenous occupations. These stops are deemed instances of *force majeure*, a legal definition which automatically extends the contract with Frontera Energy. At the time of writing they are still the operating company. Meanwhile, resource nationalist protests at the regional level and similar sentiments in Congress resulted in a change in legislation allowing the national oil company Petroperú to assume a joint venture ownership (El Peruano, 2015).

A major recent source of contention has consequently been a potential second round of previous consultation. Government actors have claimed that this is not a legal requirement, as despite Petroperú assuming ownership, there are no major changes in how it affects the local population (Javier Aroca, Subsecretary for dialogue and sustainability, Presidency of the Council of Ministers, interview with author October 2018). In October 2017 however, PUINAMUDT resorted to its most effective means to ensure previous consultation: the occupation of oil installations. In October 2017, after 44 days of complete shut-down of oil production, the government and the indigenous federation signed a new agreement, the Andoas act, which stated that if and when Petroperú and an operating partner enter into a new contract period, there will be a new previous consultation process (PUINAMUDT, 2017). This process is now ongoing, albeit with repeated delays (e.g. El Comercio, 2019; PUINAMUDT, 2019a; PUINAMUDT, 2020b; PUINAMUDT, 2019b).

The latest accord between the government and the local population was agreed upon in 2019, again in Andoas, after a week's occupation of the oilfield's airfield and pumps. Main achievements here were promises to build a previously guaranteed mini hospital in 2020, and a trust fund for environmental remediation of close to 54 million USD, implemented after a year's delay (PUINAMUDT, 2019b). Halting oil production was once again used as a bargaining chip to speed up delayed processes of public service provision.

Local communities' negotiation power is caused by their ability to disrupt spatially fixed oil production. If their territories had not been incorporated into an oilfield, then they would not have had this particular negotiation power. Top government officials are dispatched to the area to negotiate with the federations when they threaten to halt, or halt, oil production, implying that without oil production, there would be no foundation to negotiate. The resulting leverage has a self-sustaining effect, as the recent history of disruptions also impacts local communities' current negotiation power, and how government actors act towards them. If the state wants oil operation, they have to negotiate. Discussing whether previous consultation is required again or not, Javier Aroca from the Presidency of the Council of Ministers, an advisory body to the government, argued that this should not be a main preoccupation, exactly because of the recent history of forceful measures by the communities, stating that 'if the state wants this to work, the only thing they have to do is to consult' (interview with author, October 2018).

The political space for bargaining through occupations is shaped by the extractive imperative and the Peruvian state's neoliberal strategy to entice companies to invest in the country. Bebbington and Scurrah (2013) understand the actions of the local communities in Block 192 as attempts at 'bringing the state back in' (p. 189), to regulate and deliver services, and treat the local population as citizens with rights. The state has never been here in the first place however, except in the capacity to facilitate extractive activity by private companies. It has mostly played an enabling role for international investment, rather than a regulatory role (Urteaga-Crovetto, 2012). The repeated delays inherent in the scalar dynamics imply that continuing oil production is the main goal guiding political action, not local development efforts. Nonetheless, achievements have been reached, and implemented (albeit slowly and after repeated protests). The state of permanent negotiation ensures a fragile continuation of oil production, and the implementation of some environmental remediation measures and government services. The only way to draw in the state as service provider seems to be within an extractivist framework, with resulting promises that are particular to that area.

6. Convergence of aims

Local and national extractivism, coupled with a state of permanent negotiation, results in a discourse where seemingly both the state and the local indigenous communities have the same objectives: continued

extraction with high social and environmental standards, and remediation of past contamination. Alfonso López, leader of ACODECOSPAT, recognises the local dependence on oil activity which has been detailed above, and states that based on this, what they do demand is ‘environmentally and socially responsible politics that respect the lives of human beings’ (interview with author, October 2018). Similarly, the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM) argues that what they aim for is to execute well-planned processes of environmental remediation, and to have a ‘healthy field’ (Wendy Perez, Specialist in the General Office of Social Management, MEM, interview with author September 2018). MEM works locally to try to solve problems of access to health care, education and to clean up past contamination. Because if not, Perez stated ‘[the company] will not want to come in and work’ (interview with author, September 2018). MEM was furthermore having discussions with the Ministry of Finance to have more money for remediation (Fernando Castillo, Director General of the General Office of Social Management, MEM, interview with author September 2018). Again, this demonstrates that socio-environmental measures is conditioned upon continued extraction.

It is important to emphasise that this seeming convergence of aims is not based on autonomous decision-making within the state and the indigenous federations, it is rather a relational response founded on the Peruvian state’s extractivism. Continued extraction is imperative for the state, but extraction is not realised by public companies. The state therefore needs the oilfield to appear attractive for international investments, and it is not in its interest to have an oilfield marked by repeated socio-environmental protests and shut-downs of production by the local population. It is unclear how much oil is left in the oilfield, and whether increased exploration in the oilfield would lead to discoveries of any untapped reservoirs. It is an insecure investment at best, and more so if it risks repeated unrest and production halts. Due to local extractivism and ‘the misery of missing alternatives’, local communities also act with the aim of continued extraction, albeit under improved conditions. As such, both the local population represented by the four indigenous federations, and the national state represented by MEM, desire a ‘healthy’ oilfield, i.e. continued production but with high socio-environmental standards.

The more ideological notion of extractivism being ‘the logical thing to do’ in any case also has material consequences of sunk costs and path-dependencies. 3.5 billion USD have been invested in the modernisation of one of Peru’s main refineries, in Talara on the northern coast, and there are also plans to modernise the Norperuano pipeline transporting oil from the Amazon to the coast (Gestión, 2019; La República, 2015a). For these investments to make sense, oil needs to continue to flow from Block 192. In this sense, extractivism requires a planning for continued existence of oil regardless of how much of the reserves actually remain. There are very heavy-weighting incentives for the extraction of the oil that there is.

This analysis of the political space created by cross-scale extractivism points towards a major concern for all actors: What will happen when there is no more oil in Block 192? All activity discussed here is motivated by continued oil extraction. There is general agreement that the imminent contract with a duration of thirty years will be the last contract of Block 192, remaining reserves will most likely have been extracted by then. The concern for peak oil is present everywhere, in both producing and consuming areas, due to the fundamental importance of oil to any economic activity (Bridge, 2010; Bridge and Le Billon, 2017). The concern here takes on the added importance of the population in Block 192 losing their bargaining chip. The end of oil production in Block 192 will mean that both the sole local income generating opportunity, and the state’s presence, will evaporate. These are the prerequisites for both day-to-day survival and for larger improvements and local development needs. The state has economic interests in the area now, which is what gives local communities disruptive power. The local communities will as such be left with a net negative. They will have a degraded local environment and no income-generating opportunities. The dynamics of

permanent negotiation and conflictual coexistence unfortunately lead mostly to immediate and short-term gains. There is no diversification of the local economy, and no planning of what will come next for this remote and deprived area, which is moreover the most polluted in Peru.

7. The Janus face of local extractivism

The recent history of Block 192 and the dynamics between the local population and the government demonstrate that there are local positions towards extractive activity which are neither outright resistance, nor acceptance or approval. There is a local dependence on oil activity for both income opportunities and as a bargaining chip towards the government. Analytically, this implies that extractivism should be understood as a cross-scalar phenomenon, where also the sub-national level plays a key role in (re)shaping its logics, practices and ‘there is no alternative to oil’ ideology. These insights are key to understand local extractivism, and how and why it is Janus faced. The very same extractive activity which has caused the damage in the first place, is relied upon to remediate it.

Previously, extractivism has mostly been used to characterise the politics of the state, based on international capital’s national expansion, where the local scale is hit with the negative consequences of resource extraction. The imperative of continued extraction as the solution to any policy challenge and needing to take place under any circumstance can explain why expanding the extractive frontier is seen as the solution to both high and low commodity prices. Extractivism has taken on a political-ideological functioning to become a panacea and the ‘common sense’ course of action (Arsel et al., 2016b, 2016a; Svampa, 2012). The outcomes of the extractive imperative are mostly understood to be resistance and a criminalisation of protests by the state (Arsel et al., 2016a; Llave Huamancha, 2020; Silva Santisteban, 2016; Svampa, 2019). The extractive imperative has however also created a sub-national political space that can be strategically utilised by communities adjacent to extractive industries to negotiate with not only the operating company, but also the government regarding both conditions for extraction and government services. In Block 192, local indigenous federations have managed to accumulate negotiation power through collective action, and when they mobilise and halt production, top officials, including ministers, are quickly dispatched to negotiate particularistic agreements with measures specific to the area.

Conflict therefore does not necessarily entail outright rejection, there can also be a conflictual coexistence which enables a state of permanent negotiation. This is a position which can probably also be found in other areas with mature extractive industries, where the national state has been mostly a facilitator for private extractive activity, not a regulating state and certainly not a welfare state. In Block 192, this has entailed a grave lack of public services and remediation of local oil contamination. This is now demanded by the indigenous federations representing the communities in Block 192, and they have gained important concessions from the government based on their confrontational negotiation patterns. There is a limit to how much change can be achieved with this kind of militant particularism however (Harvey and Williams, 1995). Without continued oil extraction, it will break down. Local improvements are therefore based on a continuation of extractivism, and there can be no socio-environmental improvements in the area without allowing the system to continue. There is an extractivist lock-in effect.

Local actors’ room for manoeuvre is caused by commodity exporting states’ limited leeway: their position on the global market as commodity exporters demands that extractivism and export of natural resources need to continue, and this requires extractive projects without excessively disrupting socio-environmental conflicts. This understanding of the room for manoeuvre for negotiation and demand created by extractivism can be upscaled. I expect that it can be relevant for analyses of any actors demanding socio-environmental improvements that do not fundamentally challenge extractivism itself, such as certain parts of environmental civil society.

8. Conclusions

Notwithstanding important exceptions, a majority of research on extractivism in Latin America has been carried out in the context of the Latin American left, characterised by a strong state involvement in extractive industries. Within this context, the notion of extractivism as an imperative has been developed by Arsel et al. (2016b), who argue that continued and increased extraction has gained a teleological primacy, 'reorienting policy objectives to further justify and advance extractivism' (p. 881). Research from Peru demonstrates that state-led production and revenues directed to national budgets are not prerequisites for an extractive imperative, to extract all resources that can be extracted is the logical 'common sense' thing to do also in a country characterised by a neoliberal political economy (Gudynas, 2019; Silva Santisteban, 2016). The imperative of continued extraction has been emphasised in recent research from Peru, which demonstrates a delegitimisation and criminalisation of protest and lax environmental regulation (Campanera Reig, 2019; Llave Huamancha, 2020; Silva Santisteban, 2016). These analyses are characteristic of research on the consequences of extractivism, which have mostly been discussed in terms of their detrimental socio-environmental effects and the state's assaults on resistance. These are important consequences that need to be well-known, but they are not the only outcomes of the imperative to continue extraction.

This article chronicles the recent history of Peruvian oilfield Block 192. It does so through analysing 487 news items, reports from NGOs and the Peruvian Ombudsman and communications from the indigenous umbrella organisation PUNAMUDT, together with twenty-three interviews with actors involved in the Peruvian oil sector or directly in the processes regarding Block 192, carried out in Lima and Iquitos, Peru, in the autumn of 2018. It argues that the patterns of interactions between the Peruvian state and local actors in Block 192 demonstrate that the teleological primacy of continued extraction and a 'there is no alternative to oil' dogma creates room for manoeuvre that local actors can pragmatically utilise. This reading of state-society relations differs from those analyses examining local-scale resistance towards extractive projects (Avci and Fernández-Salvador, 2016; Bebbington et al., 2008; Llave Huamancha, 2020; Svampa, 2019). The literature that examines more diverse local responses to extractive activity, overwhelmingly focus on negotiations between local communities and operating company (Kuokkanen, 2019; Wanvik and Caine, 2017; Wilson, 2016). These have resulted in particularistic agreements regarding local employment, socio-environmental programmes and financing of local development efforts (Helfgott, 2013; Himley, 2013; Manky, 2020). Other mechanisms for managing social relations include EIAs and CSR, both of which may include limited local participation. The state apparatus does not have a protagonist role in these lines of research.

In Block 192 local actors utilise their demonstrated ability to impact privately run production to negotiate local 'oil for development' agreements with the national government. In these negotiations, local indigenous federations demand both remediation of past contamination caused by oil extraction, but also public services that are not directly related to extraction, such as health and education service provisions and local development programmes. Local actors have some leverage, as in a neoliberal political economy context, continued and expanded extraction is dependant upon international investments. The Peruvian state therefore needs the oilfield to appear attractive for international oil companies. It is not in its interest to have an oilfield marked by repeated socio-environmental conflicts and shutdowns of production by the local population.

For this reason, the extractive imperative can paradoxically result in opportunities for demanding, and achieving, some socio-environmental improvements. This local room for manoeuvre created by the cross-scalar imperative for continued extraction is a type of dynamic under-emphasised in previous literature. Extractivism as a concept therefore needs to be expanded geographically, to make it applicable to local

forms of dependence on extractive activities, both concretely for local livelihoods and as the local population's sole bargaining chip to demand any sort of services from the government or oil company. I liken this local scale position to a duality, the Janus face, as the very activity that has had detrimental effects on their livelihoods for decades is also their only hope.

The Janus face of local extractivism illuminates changing political geographies of the subsoil. State power and subsoil resources have been theorised to be closely connected. The state, through its role as a custodian of subterranean resources, exerts state power to secure sub-surface spaces for extraction, at the expense of populations depending on surface lands for their livelihoods (Bridge, 2014; Coronil, 1997; Shade, 2015). The findings presented in this article suggest that processes and conditions that include the local scale re-shape political geographies of extraction, as state strategies and hydrocarbon governance is partially shaped from shifting relations of leverage and veto power between the national and local scale.

To understand the continuous shaping of extractivism and its social, material and political effects, this article calls for further case study research on local actors' expectations of the state apparatus in areas where extractive activities have impacted livelihoods for decades. Research on Janus-faced extractivism across sites and political spectrum, including comparative case studies and synthesised studies, could offer purposeful insights into how resource conflicts are negotiated 'on the ground' and potentially shape strategies across scales, not least in the face of current sustained declining demand. Such research would further understanding regarding changes to the spatialities of state-society relations, mediated through the political geographies of extraction.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to interview partners in Peru for generously sharing their knowledge and opinions, and to the Centre for Applied Geographical Research (*Centro de Investigación en Geografía Aplicada*) at the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú for generously providing an office space during the time of fieldwork. I am also grateful to Jemima García-Godos, Berit Kristoffersen and two anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback, and to Laura Führer, Sigurd M. N. Oppegaard, Hege Bakke Sørreime and Sabina Tica for useful input on a draft version of this article.

References

- Acosta, A., 2013. Extractivism and neoextractivism: two sides of the same curse. In: Lang, M., Mokrani, D. (Eds.), *Beyond Development: Alternative Visions from Latin America*. Transnational Institute, Amsterdam.
- Acuña, R.M., 2015. The politics of extractive governance: indigenous peoples and socio-environmental conflicts. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 2 (1), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2014.11.007>.
- AFP. (2017). *Indígenas De Perú exigen Consulta Previa Ante Licitación Petrolera*.
- Aguilar-Støen, M., Hirsch, C., 2015. Environmental impact assessments, local power and self-determination: the case of mining and hydropower development in Guatemala. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 2 (3), 472–479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.03.001>.
- Arsel, M., Hogenboom, B., Pellegrini, L., 2016a. The extractive imperative and the boom in environmental conflicts at the end of the progressive cycle in Latin America. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 3 (4), 877–879. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2016.10.013>.
- Arsel, M., Hogenboom, B., Pellegrini, L., 2016b. The extractive imperative in Latin America. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 3 (4), 880–887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2016.10.014>.
- Arsel, M., Pellegrini, L., Mena, C., 2019. *Maria's paradox: oil extraction and the misery of missing development alternatives in the ecuadorian Amazon. Immiserizing Growth: When Growth Fails the Poor*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Avci, D., Fernández-Salvador, C., 2016. Territorial dynamics and local resistance: two mining conflicts in Ecuador compared. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 3 (4), 912–921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2016.10.007>.
- Bebbington, A., Hinojosa, L., Bebbington, D.H., Burneo, M.L., Warnars, X., 2008. Contention and ambiguity: mining and the possibilities of development: mining and the possibilities of development. *Dev Change* 39 (6), 887–914. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2008.00517.x>.

- Bebbington, A., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Hinojosa, L., Burneo, M.-L., Bury, J. 2013. Anatomies of conflict: social mobilization and new political ecologies of the Andes. In: Bebbington, A., Bury, J. (Eds.), *Subterranean Struggles: New Dynamics of Mining, Oil, and Gas in Latin America*. University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. 241–266.
- Bebbington, A., Scurrah, M. 2013. Hydrocarbon conflicts and indigenous peoples in the peruvian amazon: mobilization and negotiation along the Río Corrientes. In: Bebbington, A., Bury, J. (Eds.), *Subterranean Struggles: New Dynamics of Mining, Oil, and Gas in Latin America*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bridge, G., 2010. Geographies of peak oil: the other carbon problem. *Geoforum* 41 (4), 523–530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.06.002>.
- Bridge, G., 2014. Resource geographies II: the resource-state nexus. *Prog Hum Geogr* 38 (1), 118–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513493379>.
- Bridge, G., Le Billon, P., 2017. *Oil*. Polity Press, Malden, MA.
- Campanario Baqué, Y., Doyle, C., 2017. El Daño No Se Olvida: Impactos Socioambientales En Los Pueblos Indígenas De La Amazonia Norperuana Afectados Por Las Operaciones De La Empresa Pluspetrol (Primera Edición). EQUIDAD. Centro de Políticas Públicas y Derechos Humanos, Lima, Perú.
- Campanera Reig, M., 2019. Política ambiental peruana, 1990-2015: el impulso del extractivismo. In: Cortés Vázquez, J.A., Beltran, O. (Eds.), *Repensar La conservación: Naturaleza, Mercado y Sociedad Civil*. Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, pp. 125–148.
- Coronil, F., 1997. *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London.
- Defensoría del Pueblo, 2018. *Salud De Los Pueblos Indígenas Amazónicos y Explotación Petrolera En Los Lotes 192 y 8: ¿ Se Cumplen Los Acuerdos En El Perú?*, Lima.
- Dietz, K., Engels, B., 2017. Contested extractivism, society and the state: an introduction. In: Engels, B., Dietz, K. (Eds.), *Contested Extractivism, Society and the State: Struggles over Mining and Land*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 1–19.
- Doyle, J., 1994. *Crude Awakenings: The Oil Mess in America: Wasting Energy Jobs and the Environment*. Friends of the Earth, Washington DC.
- DPAES. (2017). Indígenas de la Amazonía peruana toman aeródromo de campo petrolero.
- El Comercio, 2015. Nativos Mantienen Toma De Helipuerto De Andoas Por Tercer Día. Retrieved from <https://elcomercio.pe/peru/loreto/nativos-mantienen-toma-helipuerto-andoas-tercer-dia-213485-noticia/>.
- El Comercio, 2019. Lote 192: ¿Cuáles Son Los Escenarios Si No Terminan a Tiempo La Consulta Previa? Retrieved from <https://elcomercio.pe/peru/loreto/lote-192-cuales-son-los-escenarios-si-no-terminan-a-tiempo-la-consulta-previa-noticia/>.
- El Peruano, 2015. Ley Número 30357. Retrieved from <https://busquedas.elperuano.pe/normaslegales/ley-que-incorpora-una-cuarta-disposicion-complementaria-fina-ley-n-30357-1308828-1/>.
- Espinosa, Ó., 2009. ¿Salvajes opuestos al progreso?: aproximaciones históricas y antropológicas a las movilizaciones indígenas en la Amazonía peruana. *Anthropologica Del Departamento De Ciencias Sociales* 27 (27), 123–168.
- Farthing, L., Fabricant, N., 2018. Open veins revisited: charting the social, economic, and political contours of the new extractivism in Latin America. *Lat Am Perspect* 45 (5), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X18785882>.
- Galeano, E., 1973. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. Monthly Review Press, New York, NY.
- Gestión. (2019). Congreso Declara De Interés Nacional La Modernización Del Oleoducto Norperuano. Retrieved from <https://gestion.pe/economia/congreso-declara-de-interes-nacional-la-modernizacion-del-oleoducto-norperuano-noticia/?ref=gesr>.
- Grillo, M.T., Sharon, T., 2012. *Peru's amazonian imaginary: marginality, territory and national integration*. Environment and Citizenship in Latin America. Berghahn Books, New York, pp. 112–128.
- Gudynas, E. (2010). *The New Extractivism of the 21st Century: Ten Urgent Theses About Extractivism in Relation to Current South American Progressivism*. Americas Program Report, 1–14.
- Gudynas, E. (2019). Hasta la última gota: las narrativas que sostienen a los extractivismos. *RevLISE*, 15–31.
- Guzmán-Gallegos, M.A., 2017. Between oil contamination and consultation: constrained spaces of influence in Northern Peruvian Amazonia. *Third World Q* 38 (5), 1110–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1294979>.
- Harvey, D., Williams, R., 1995. Militant particularism and global ambition: the conceptual politics of place, space, and environment in the work of Raymond Williams. *Social Text* 69 (42). <https://doi.org/10.2307/466665>.
- Hayk, A.-C., 2019. Enabling locally-embedded corporate social responsibility: a constructivist perspective on international oil companies delivering healthcare in rural Ghana. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 6 (4), 1224–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2019.08.006>.
- Helfgott, F.M., 2013. *Transformations in Labor, Land and Community: Mining and Society in pasco, Peru, 20th Century to the Present*. University of Michigan, US. Doctoral dissertation.
- Himley, M., 2013. Regularizing extraction in andean peru: mining and social mobilization in an age of corporate social responsibility. *Antipode* 45 (2), 394–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.01001.x>.
- Hudayana, B., Suharko, Widayanta, Ab, 2020. Communal violence as a strategy for negotiation: community responses to nickel mining industry in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 7 (4), 1547–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.08.012>.
- Kuokkanen, R., 2019. At the intersection of Arctic indigenous governance and extractive industries: a survey of three cases. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 6 (1), 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.08.011>.
- La República. (2015a). Alonso Segura: La autografía Sobre El Lote 192 Tiene Problemas De Inconstitucionalidad. Retrieved from <https://larepublica.pe/economia/88444>
- 1-alonso-segura-la-autografa-sobre-el-lote-192-tiene-problemas-de-inconstitucionalidad/.
- La República. (2015b). Lote 192: Ninguno a los Indígenas. Retrieved from <http://larepublica.pe/politica/577447-lote-192-ninguno-a-los-indigenas/>.
- La Torre Lopez, L., 1998. Sólo queremos vivir en paz! Experiencias petroleras en territorios indígenas de la Amazonía peruana. Grupo Internacional de Trabajo Sobre Asuntos Indígenas. IWGLA) y Grupo de Trabajo Racimos de Ungurahui, Copenhagen.
- Lang, M., 2011. Crisis civilizatoria y desafíos para las izquierdas. In: Lang, M., Mokrani, D. (Eds.), *Más Allá Del Desarrollo*. Fundación Rosa Luxemburg, Abya Yala, Quito.
- Llave Huamancha, D.F., 2020. Extractivismo en la Amazonía peruana: tensión y relación entre el estado y los pueblos indígenas. *Antrópica. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades* 6 (12), 49–75.
- Manky, O., 2020. The end of mining labor struggles? The changing dynamics of labor in Latin America. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 7 (3), 1121–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.07.007>.
- McNeish, J.-A., 2012. More than Beads and Feathers: resource Extraction and the Indigenous Challenge in Latin America. In: Haarstad, H. (Ed.), *New Political Spaces in Latin American Resource Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Ministerio de Energía y Minas. (1998). Evaluación ambiental Territorial de las Cuencas de los ríos Tigre-Pastaza. Retrieved from Ministerio De Energía y Minas, Dirección General De Asuntos Ambientales website: http://www.minem.gob.pe/minem/archivos/file/DGAAM/publicaciones/evats/tig_past/pastaza.pdf.
- Ministerio del Ambiente. (2015). Acta De Lima. Retrieved from <http://www.minam.gob.pe/oas/wp-content/uploads/sites/49/2017/04/18-Acta-Lima-M2-10.03.15.pdf>.
- Mulhern, R., Mulhern, M., & Perreault, T. (2020). Contesting the social license to operate: competing visions and community exclusion on the Bolivian Altiplano. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, S2214790X20302549. [10.1016/j.exis.2020.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.08.014).
- Nguyen, N. (2020). A Review of Social License to Operate in Southeast Asian mining. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, S2214790X20302926. [10.1016/j.exis.2020.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.11.007).
- O'Callaghan-Gordo, C., Flores, J.A., Lizárraga, P., Okamoto, T., Papoulias, D.M., Barclay, F., Astete, J., 2018. Oil extraction in the Amazon basin and exposure to metals in indigenous populations. *Environ. Res.* 162, 226–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.013>.
- Ofori, J.J.Y., Ofori, D.R., 2019. Earning a social license to operate: perspectives of mining communities in Ghana. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 6 (2), 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.11.005>.
- Orta Martínez, M., Napolitano, D.A., MacLennan, G.J., O'Callaghan, C., Ciborowski, S., Fabregas, X., 2007. Impacts of petroleum activities for the Achuar people of the Peruvian Amazon: summary of existing evidence and research gaps. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 2 (4), 045006 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/2/4/045006>.
- Orta-Martínez, M., Pellegrini, L., Arsel, M., 2018. The squeaky wheel gets the grease? The conflict imperative and the slow fight against environmental injustice in northern Peruvian Amazon. *Ecol. Soc.* 23 (3) <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-10098-230307-art7>.
- Peterson St-Laurent, G., Billon, P.L., 2015. Staking claims and shaking hands: impact and benefit agreements as a technology of government in the mining sector. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 2 (3), 590–602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.06.001>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2015a). Acta De Reunión. Retrieved from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/ACTA-TENIENTE-LOPEZ-W.pdf>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2015b). Acta De Reunión Federaciones Nativas de Las 4 Cuencas FECONACO, FEDIQUEP, OPIKAFPE y ACODESCOPAT - Sectores del Ejecutivo. Retrieved from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ACTA-DE-REUNION-FEDERACIONES-NATIVAS-DE-LAS-4-CUENCAS-EJECUTIVO-05-11.15.pdf>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2015c). Ollanta Humala visita Comunidad De La Cuenca Del Marañon e inaugura Planta Provisional De Tratamiento De Agua. Retrieved 11 June 2020, from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/ollanta-humala-visita-comunidad-de-la-cuenca-del-maranon-e-inaugura-planta-provisional-de-tratamiento-de-agua/>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2017). Acta De Andoas. Retrieved from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/ActaNuevoAndoas2017.pdf>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2019a). Ministerio De Energía y Minas Incumple Cronograma De Consulta Previa y Abandona Proceso En Etapa Informativa. Retrieved 11 June 2020, from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/ministerio-de-energia-y-minas-incumple-cronograma-de-consulta-previa-y-abandona-proceso-en-etapa-informativa/>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2019b). Minsa Se Compromete a Construir Hospital En Andoas y MINEM a Transferir Fondos Para Remediación De Sitios Contaminados Del Lote 192. Retrieved 11 June 2020, from https://observatoriopetroloero.org/minsa-se-compromete-a-construir-hospital-en-andoas-y-minem-a-transferir-fondos-para-remediacion-de-sitios-contaminados-del-lote-192/?fbclid=IwAR2d6rS3xla1_Qvvh-Eby-YP4rj9nOmX87SSpoSVFEwotAQHSQ1IhMk7Q.
- PUINAMUDT. (2020a). Observatorio Petroloero de La Amazonía Norte. Retrieved from <https://observatoriopetroloero.org/>.
- PUINAMUDT. (2020b). Fracaso reunión para reanudar consulta Previa del Lote 192. (Accessed 11 June 2020).
- Rosell-Melé, A., Moraleta-Cibrián, N., Cartró-Sabaté, M., Colomer-Ventura, F., Mayor, P., Orta-Martínez, M., 2018. Oil pollution in soils and sediments from the Northern Peruvian Amazon. *Sci. Total Environ.* 610–611, 1010–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.208>.
- Shade, L., 2015. Sustainable development or sacrifice zone? Politics below the surface in post-neoliberal Ecuador. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 2 (4), 775–784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.07.004>.
- Silva Santisteban, R., 2016. Perros y antimneros: discursos extractivistas y prácticas represivas en el Perú. *Tabula Rasa* 24 (enero-junio), 79–104.

- Smart, S., 2020. The Political Economy of Latin American Conflicts Over Mining Extractivism. *The Extractive Industries and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.02.004>. S2214790X19300760.
- Stammler, F., & Ivanova, A. (2016). Confrontation, coexistence or co-ignorance? Negotiating human-resource relations in two Russian regions. *Extractive Industries Soc.*, 3(1), 60–72. [10.1016/j.exis.2015.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.12.003).
- Svampa, M., 2012. Consenso de los commodities, giro ecoterritorial y pensamiento crítico en América Latina. *Observatorio Social de América Latina* 8 (32), 15–38.
- Svampa, M., 2019. *Neo-Extractivism in Latin America: Socio-environmental Conflicts, the Territorial Turn, and New Political Narratives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Szablowski, D., 2019. “Legal enclosure” and resource extraction: territorial transformation through the enclosure of local and indigenous law. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 6 (3), 722–732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.12.005>.
- UNDP Peru, 2018. *Estudio Técnico Independiente Del Ex Lote 1AB: Lineamientos estratégicos Para La Remediación De Los Impactos De Las Operaciones Petroleras En El Ex Lote 1AB En Loreto*. PNUD Perú, Perú. Lima, Perú.
- Urteaga-Crovetto, P., 2012. The broker state and the ‘inevitability’ of progress: impacts of the Camisea project on indigenous People in Peru. In: Sawyer, S., Gomez, E.T. (Eds.), *The Politics of Resource Extraction: Indigenous Peoples, Multinational Corporations and the State*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 103–128.
- Wanvik, T.I., Caine, K., 2017. Understanding indigenous strategic pragmatism: métis engagement with extractive industry developments in the Canadian North. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 4 (3), 595–605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2017.04.002>.
- Wilson, E., 2016. What is the social licence to operate? Local perceptions of oil and gas projects in Russia’s Komi Republic and Sakhalin Island. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 3 (1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.09.001>.
- Yusta-García, R., Orta-Martínez, M., Mayor, P., González-Crespo, C., Rosell-Melé, A., 2017. Water contamination from oil extraction activities in Northern Peruvian Amazonian rivers. *Environ. Pollut.* 225, 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.02.063>.
- Zilliox, S., Smith, J.M., 2017. Supreregulatory agreements and unconventional energy development: learning from citizen concerns, enforceability and participation in Colorado. *Extractive Industries Soc.* 4 (1), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2016.11.008>.